

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C. May 15, 1953

The eighth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1953, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, May 15, 1953. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. de Weldon,
Mr. Biddle,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and
Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on April 13, 1953, were approved.

2. LETTER FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ARTS: The Secretary presented a letter, for the information of the Commission, advising that the Federation has ceased printing the "Magazine of Art" and has combined its editorial work with "Art News." High cost of printing was given as the reason (Exhibit A).

The Commission expressed regret about this, since the "Magazine of Art" has for several decades been one of the most influential art magazines of this country.

3. ART AND GOVERNMENT: Chairman Finley reported that since six out of seven members of the Commission had favored printing a report from the Archivist of the United States, giving references to Art Material in the National Archives, in the forthcoming Report on Art and Government, he had included the article in the Report, which is now being printed.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF THE FIVE LARGEST

Held in Washington, D. C. May 12, 1953

The eight meeting of the Commission of Five Largest, during the fiscal year

1952, was held in the Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday,

May 12, 1953. The following members were present:

Mr. Philip C. Shelton, Chairman,
Mr. Keith,
Prof. Robert,
Mr. Holloman,
Mr. Ladd,
Mr. de Haven,
Mr. Biddle,

Also Mr. J. I. Thompson, Secretary and

Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The minutes of the meeting

the Commission of Five Largest, held on April 12, 1953, were approved.

2. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY: The Secretary presented

letter for the information of the Commission, advising that the Federation

is currently studying the "Legislation of 1952" and has completed the editorial work

on the report. It is one of printing was given to the room (Exhibit A).

The Commission expressed regret about this, since the legislation of 1952

is for several years been one of the most important legislative acts of this

country.

3. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN: Chairman Philip C. Shelton stated that since the end of

the members of the Commission had received various printing reports from the various

the United States, giving references to the material in the National Archives,

the forwarding report on the end Government, he had included the article in

the report, which is now being printed.

The Secretary reported that every effort is being made, and it is expected, the Report on Art and Government will be available for distribution by the latter part of June.

4. PORTRAIT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON BY CHARLES WILLSON PEALE: Chairman Finley brought to the attention of the Commission a letter dated April 29th from Mr. H. G. Crim, Chief Usher of the White House, enclosing a letter from Mr. Mihran N. Costikyan, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York, together with a photograph in color and a brochure regarding a "Portrait of General Washington at Princeton with Nassau Hall in the Background," attributed to Charles Willson Peale, which Mr. Costikyan hopes may be accepted as a gift to the White House if presented by a donor agreeable to the President. Mr. Costikyan does not identify the proposed donor.

Mr. Finley stated that the portrait was first offered to the White House in 1948 in a letter received from Mr. James St. L. O'Toole, 24 East 64th Street, New York, but as stated by Mr. Costikyan in his letter to the President of March 19, 1953, the donor was unacceptable and the White House refused further consideration of the portrait.

The Commission inspected the photograph, and recommended that the portrait be not accepted for the White House, particularly as the donor is not identified (Exhibit B). The Commission decided that it is important in all cases that the Commission of Fine Arts and the White House should know the name of a proposed donor before indicating that a gift would be accepted.

5. RINCON ANNEX POST OFFICE (SAN FRANCISCO) PAINTINGS: Chairman Finley reported that a few days ago a Committee Hearing was held at the Capitol (Congressman Scudder, of California, Chairman of the subcommittee) on H. J. Res 211, which contemplates removal of these paintings (Exhibit C). The Commission discussed the subject.

The Secretary reported that every effort is being made, and it is expected, that the Report of the Committee will be available for distribution by the latter part of June.

4. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ALLEGED GIFT OF A PORTRAIT OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE WHITE HOUSE. The Committee on the Alleged Gift of a Portrait of the President to the White House, which was organized on June 1, 1953, and which has since that time been engaged in a study of the matter, has the honor to report to the President and the Vice President that it has completed its investigation and has prepared a report thereon. The report is being submitted to the President and the Vice President for their consideration and action. The report contains a detailed account of the facts and circumstances surrounding the alleged gift of a portrait of the President to the White House, and it also contains the Committee's conclusions and recommendations. The Committee believes that the gift of the portrait was a violation of the rules of the White House, and it recommends that the portrait be removed from the White House and that the person who gave it be punished. The Committee also recommends that the rules of the White House be strengthened to prevent such a violation from occurring again.

The Committee has also conducted an investigation into the matter of the alleged gift of a portrait of the President to the White House, and it has found that the gift was indeed made. The Committee has also found that the gift was made in violation of the rules of the White House, and it has recommended that the portrait be removed from the White House and that the person who gave it be punished. The Committee has also recommended that the rules of the White House be strengthened to prevent such a violation from occurring again.

5. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ALLEGED GIFT OF A PORTRAIT OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE WHITE HOUSE. The Committee on the Alleged Gift of a Portrait of the President to the White House, which was organized on June 1, 1953, and which has since that time been engaged in a study of the matter, has the honor to report to the President and the Vice President that it has completed its investigation and has prepared a report thereon. The report is being submitted to the President and the Vice President for their consideration and action. The report contains a detailed account of the facts and circumstances surrounding the alleged gift of a portrait of the President to the White House, and it also contains the Committee's conclusions and recommendations. The Committee believes that the gift of the portrait was a violation of the rules of the White House, and it recommends that the portrait be removed from the White House and that the person who gave it be punished. The Committee also recommends that the rules of the White House be strengthened to prevent such a violation from occurring again.

The Chairman stated that the mural paintings in the United States Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco were executed under a contract made with Mr. Anton Refregier in 1941 by the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency. The Commission of Fine Arts was not asked to choose the painter or to approve the design for the paintings or the manner in which they were executed.

Subsequently, in May, 1948, the Commission was requested by the Public Buildings Administration for advice as to whether two of the 27 panels conformed to the specifications of the contract, as shown in the full-size cartoons that were submitted by the artist before the execution of the paintings. The then Chairman of the Commission replied that, in certain respects, the two panels did not conform to specifications. The artist subsequently made the corrections suggested and the panels were approved by the Public Buildings Administration and were executed by the artist. The Commission did not express an opinion as to the subject or design of the paintings or the manner of execution, since these were never submitted to the Commission for approval.

The Commission of Fine Arts has not been consulted with reference to the proposed removal of the paintings from the Post Office as provided in H. J. Res. 211, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Scudder on March 5, 1953, and referred to the House Committee on Public Works reading as follows:

"Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of the House Committee on Public Works that the mural paintings decorating the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco, California, have been criticized by civic groups, veterans' organizations, and patriotic and fraternal societies, as well as by local newspapers and numerous individuals as being artistically offensive and historically inaccurate; and

"Whereas, the murals cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers and the history of the great State of California,

The Chairman stated that the mural paintings in the United States Lincoln
and West Office in San Francisco were ordered under a contract made with
Western Artisan in 1941 by the Public Buildings Administration, Federal
Bureau of Investigation. The Commission of Fine Arts was not asked to choose the painter
to approve the design for the paintings or the manner in which they were
executed.

Subsequently, in May, 1942, the Commission was requested by the Public
Buildings Administration for advice as to whether two of the 27 panels con-
tained to the specifications of the contract, as shown in the full-size car-
tuns that were submitted by the artist before the execution of the paintings.
The Chairman of the Commission replied that, in certain respects, the two
panels did not conform to specifications. The artist subsequently made the
provisions suggested and the panels were approved by the Public Buildings
Administration and were executed by the artist. The Commission did not express
opinion as to the subject or design of the paintings or the manner of execu-
tion, since these were never submitted to the Commission for approval.

The Commission of Fine Arts has not been consulted with reference to the
proposed removal of the paintings from the Post Office as provided in H. R.
211, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Bonner of
Ohio, 2, 1952, and referred to the House Committee on Public Works during its

minutes:

Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of the House
Committee on Public Works that the mural paintings depicting the
life of the Union during the American Revolution, California,
have been exhibited by civic groups, veterans' organizations, and
patriotic and historical societies, as well as by local newspapers
and numerous individuals in being exhibited in various parts of the
country in connection with

Whereas, the mural is a masterpiece and an important contribution
to the character of the Government and the history of the State
of California,

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the Administrator of General Services shall take such action as may be necessary for the prompt removal of the mural paintings on the lobby walls of the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco, California."

The Commission of Fine Arts has not been requested for its opinion by the Subcommittee on Public Works, to which the bill has been referred. In the event the opinion of the Commission is requested either by Committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or by the Public Buildings Administration, the Commission of Fine Arts authorizes the Chairman to state that, in principle, they are opposed to the destruction of any creative work of art; that, in their opinion, the paintings in the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco were executed by a competent artist; that the Commission of Fine Arts have not viewed the paintings but have been informed that the Directors of the three art museums in San Francisco consider these paintings "admirable works of art;" and, furthermore, that the Commission are opposed to the removal of paintings or sculpture, which have been executed by competent artists under contract with the Government and placed in public buildings by proper authority, unless an adequate reason exists for such removal.

6. INTERSTATE BUILDING ASSOCIATION AND PROPOSED ALTERATION OF THE

WASHINGTON BUILDING: The Commission were in conference with Mr. John M. Frier and Jack Miner, representing the Bank Building Equipment Corporation, of St. Louis, also with Roger Wells, representing the Regal Neon Sign Company, of Washington.

Mr. Miner said that the Interstate Building Association formerly was located on the second floor of the Washington Building; then because of growth of business, they moved down to the second floor, and now a further growth caused them to plan to enlarge their quarters so as to take in the corner of the building. They lease from Weaver Brothers, the owners, and pay \$2400 a month rent.

THEY, THEREFORE, AS IT RESOLVED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN JOINT SESSION ASSEMBLED, that the Administrator of General Services shall take such action as may be necessary for the prompt removal of the mural paintings on the lobby walls of the Lincoln Annex Post Office in San Francisco, California.

The Commission of Fine Arts has not been requested for its opinion by the committee on Public Buildings, to which the bill has been referred. In the event of opinion of the Commission is requested either by Committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or by the Public Buildings Administration, the Commission of Fine Arts authorized the Chairman to state that, in principle, they are opposed to the destruction of any creative work of art; that, in their opinion, the paintings in the Lincoln Annex Post Office in San Francisco were created by a competent artist; that the Commission of Fine Arts have not viewed the paintings but have been informed that the Director of the Arts and Crafts in San Francisco consider these paintings "admirable works of art"; furthermore, that the Commission are opposed to the removal of paintings, sculpture, which have been executed by competent artists under contract with the Government and placed in public buildings by proper authority, unless an adequate reason exists for such removal.

2. INTERSTATE BUILDING ASSOCIATION AND PROPOSED ALTERATION OF THE

SHAW-WORTH BUILDING: The Commission were in conference with Mr. John H. Shaw, President of the Interstate Building Association, on the 14th day of January, 1934, representing the Shaw-Worth Building Corporation, of St. Louis, also with Roger Wells, representing the St. Louis Trust Company, of St. Louis. Mr. Shaw said that the Interstate Building Association formerly was located on the second floor of the Washington Building; that because of growth of business, they moved down to the second floor, and now a further growth would then be planned to enlarge their quarters so as to take in the corner of the building. They lease the corner from the owners, and pay \$2,500 a month rent.

Mr. Miner then called attention to the plans and perspective, which indicated that the St. Louis firm proposes to alter the exterior of the northwest corner of the Washington Building in a streamlined contemporary office building style so as to mutilate the facade.

Mr. Weild said "I think you destroy a very important line of that building, when you propose this." Prof. Belluschi said it is a style of treatment that is not proper for that location.

Dean Hudnut said, "Mr. Chairman, if I understand the general policy of this Commission, it is to encourage and to possibly maintain a harmony between the great Government scheme of the McMillan Commission and its environs. It is that harmony, the variance of the harmony with government buildings that we are concerned with. It seems to me that while the building is by no means a masterpiece of architecture, the architect obviously tried to acknowledge the necessity of this harmony. He tried to bring his building into a reasonable harmony with the great building on the opposite side of the street. Whereas, this design, regardless of its merit as architecture in the abstract, has given no indication that the architect gave any regard to the facade of the Washington Building nor the monumental Treasury Department across the street. He merely takes his knife, sharpens it, and slashes in there and draws something which has nothing to do with either one. Therefore, I am opposed to the design regardless of any merit it may have as a design, because it is not consistent with the basic policy of this Commission."

Mr. Miner then argued that what his firm proposed to do would be an improvement on the stores now on the first floor of the Washington Building covered with peanut signs and liquor signs, and the like.

Dean Hudnut replied, "That is beside the point. I do not say that you must remodel as a Government building, but I think we ought to insist upon a decent

Mr. Minor then called attention to the plan and suggested, with regard to

the plan, that the building should be placed on the corner of the northwest

corner of the Washington building in a rectangular contemporary style building

the so as to make the blocks.

Mr. Minor said "I think you suggested very interesting line of the building."

Mr. Minor said "That, I think, is in a style of treatment that

not proper for this location."

Mr. Minor said, "I understand the general policy of this

institution, it is to encourage and to develop building a harmony between the

the Government and some of the American Government and its system. It is the

very, the variance of the building with government buildings that we are con-

sidering. It seems to me that while the building is by no means a master-

piece of architecture, the architect certainly tried to make the building

typical of this country. He tried to make his building into a harmonious harmony

with the great building on the opposite side of the street. However, this

style, however, of the building is in the interest, but giving no

impression that the building was in the line of the building on the Washington

building nor the building on the opposite side of the street. He merely

has the building, however, and it seems to me that there is something which

is missing in the building. I am opposed to the design

because of my belief that it is not in the line of the building, because it is not in the

the line of the building of the Government."

Mr. Minor then suggested that the building should be placed on the corner of the northwest

corner of the Washington building in a rectangular contemporary style building

the so as to make the blocks.

Mr. Minor said "I think you suggested very interesting line of the building."

Mr. Minor said "That, I think, is in a style of treatment that

respect for the character of those buildings around it."

The Secretary then asked to be permitted to make a brief statement. He said, "The architectural firm of Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott, of Boston, designed the Washington Building several decades ago. With its great overhang and huge arched windows, it reminds one of a Renaissance Building. Certainly the Washington Building was designed for that location at Fifteenth Street and New York Avenue near the Treasury, and a block away from the White House; and after nearly three decades, it has come to be regarded in the way of architecture as one of the monuments in Washington.

Now it has happened a number of times in my experience in the years past, when alterations were proposed by someone else, that the architect of the building, when it is of a monumental nature, should be consulted."

Dean Hudnut said that this is a good precedent to follow, and Mr. Miner agreed to confer with a member of that firm, Henry R. Shepley (a former member of the Commission of Fine Arts) if that was desired.

After some further discussion, the Commission decided that the design should be restudied; and with a view to conserving time, the Commission informed Mr. Miner and Mr. Frier that conclusions reached with regard to changes that should be shown in a revised design would be formulated later in the day.

The Commission discussed the subject thoroughly in the afternoon session, and reached the following conclusions:

The Commission unanimously decided that the design should receive further study, and suggest that the basic principle should be an attempt to effect harmony between the new alterations and the existing design of the building. To effect this harmony, the Commission suggest the following expedients:

1. The decorated cresting which crowns the glass front of the first story should be continuous around the two facades of the building.

2. At the corner of the building, the present glass display space should remain except where two openings are needed to give access to the vestibule. These doorways should be placed as far as may be practicable from the point of intersection as the Building Code allows.

and the character of these buildings should be.

The Society then asked to be permitted to make a brief statement.

id, "The architectural firm of Colledge, Shanks, Bulfinch and Abbott, of Boston, designed the Washington Building several decades ago. With the great

ermy and huge arched windows, it reminds one of a Renaissance building.

Finally the Washington Building was designed for this location at the south

west end New York Avenue near the Treasury, and a block away from the White

use; and after nearly three decades, it has come to be regarded in the city

architecture as one of the landmarks in Washington.

Now it has happened a number of times that experience in the years past,

an alteration was proposed by someone else, that the architect of the building

when it is of a monumental nature, should be consulted."

Dean Robert said that this is a good precedent to follow, and Mr. Shaw

said he would like a member of the firm, Henry A. Shreve, to be present

the Committee to this point in the discussion.

After some further discussion, the Committee decided that the building should

restored; and with a view to conserving it, the Committee decided to have

it. After that committee reached with regard to changes that would be

own in a revised design would be formulated later in the day.

The Committee discussed the subject thoroughly in the afternoon session,

and reached the following conclusions:

The Committee unanimously decided that the building should be restored
further work, and suggest that the building should be
attempt to effect harmony between the new alterations and the existing
design of the building. To effect this purpose, the Committee suggest
the following explanation:

1. The decorated exterior which covers the glass front of the
first story should be continued around the two stories of the building.

2. At the corner of the building, the corner glass facade
should be retained except where two stories are needed for the
entrance to the vestibule. These stories should be placed at the
entrance from the point of intersection in the building.

3. Hold as close to the post as it originally was.

4. Column No. 1 should remain in place as it now is in its present state.

5. The advertising sign should be reduced in area so that neither sign exceeds more than 25 square feet; that is, the new sign shall occupy the fascia under the present cresting, and in no case should a sign exceed 25 square feet in area.

This information was conveyed to Messrs. Frier and Miner, who had thanked the Commission for the help the Secretary had given them in this matter.

It was decided that prints of the revised sketch should be sent to the architect members of the Commission for approval or further recommendations.

7. **FOGGY BOTTOM DEVELOPMENT:** The Commission were in conference with Mr. John Nolen, Director of Planning, of the National Capital Planning Commission, concerning the proposed apartment and office building development in the area known as Foggy Bottom at the intersection of Virginia Avenue and New Hampshire Avenues, Northwest. In view of the magnitude of the project and its location adjacent to the Rock Creek Parkway and the Potomac water front, the Commission expressed the desire to have the views of the National Capital Planning Commission in this matter, and as it would concern the proposed bridge development from E Street extended, across Theodore Roosevelt Island to Virginia.

Mr. L. L. Hunter, Acting Supervising Architect, and Mr. J. A. Hagemann, Site Planner, of the Public Buildings Office, General Services Administration, were present.

Mr. Nolen stated that the National Capital Planning Commission had not taken action as to the project but had expressed concern over what is proposed:

(a) An encroachment on Government building area. There is the waterfront development for Georgetown, and a series of low semi-public buildings have been suggested by Hon. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, - a continuation of those along Constitution Avenue; land to take in the Heurich Brewery is now being purchased by the Government, Congress having made available \$2,000,000 for this purpose.

(b) The apartment would be 235 feet high, about half as high as the Washington Monument, and it would be 100 feet higher than the Lincoln Memorial, the elevation of which is 140 feet.

(c) It would exceed the height of buildings allowed under the Zoning Law, and special legislation would have to be secured from Congress to permit the erection of the building to a height of 235 feet.

(d) It would create a bad precedent in the District of Columbia, since apartment projects are proposed constantly.

(e) Attention was called to an apartment development on the Virginia side of the Potomac, near Rosslyn.

While the project awaits the outcome of a six-months' option on the land, which expires next September, Mr. Nolen felt it would be timely if the Commission of Fine Arts would join the National Capital Planning Commission in protesting against the proposed high building.

A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit D).

8. **EXTENSION OF THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT AREA:** The Commission considered with Mr. Nolen the question of having a new map of the Shipstead-Luce Act area prepared. Attention was called to the fact that no revised map had been prepared since the year 1939.

Mr. Peets called attention to the complaint received by the Commission of Fine Arts recently concerning the cheap type of brick residences that were built along the George Washington Memorial Parkway adjacent to MacArthur Boulevard. He was of the opinion that the National Capital Planning Commission would not want to see encroachment on the Parkway continued in that manner.

Mr. Nolen agreed that there are several places in the Metropolitan area of Washington, where it would be a good thing to apply building restrictions through such provisions of an Act of Congress as the Shipstead-Luce Act. It presents a problem for study.

The Commission suggested that Mr. Peets consider the matter in cooperation with Mr. Nolen, with a view to offering desirable amendments for a revised

(2) The apartment would be 235 feet high, about half as high as the Washington Monument, and it would be 100 feet higher than the Lincoln Memorial, the elevation of which is 110 feet.

(3) It would exceed the height of buildings allowed under the zoning law, and special legislation would have to be secured from Congress to permit the erection of the building to a height of 235 feet.

(4) It would create a bad precedent in the District of Columbia, since apartment projects are proposed constantly.

(5) Attention was called to an apartment development on the Virginia side of the Potomac, near Leesylvania.

While the project awaits the outcome of a city-controllers' opinion on the land, for expires next September, Mr. Tolson told it would be timely if the Committee on of Time also would join the National Capital Planning Commission in protesting against the proposed high building.

A copy of the discussion he attended here and made a part of these notes (Exhibit D).

5. EXTENSION OF THE SHIPYARD-LINE NOT AHEAD: The Commission considered the Mr. Tolson the question of having a new map of the Shipyard-Line not extended. Attention was called to the fact that no building had been proposed since the year 1937.

Mr. Tolson called attention to the committee reported by the Commission of the line recently concerning the ship line of which buildings had been built along the Potomac. Mr. Tolson said that the National Capital Planning Commission would not have to be concerned with the Potomac, contained in that report. Mr. Tolson agreed that there are several blocks in the neighborhood, where it would be a good thing to have building restrictions, except such restrictions of a lot of buildings as the Shipyard-Line not. The Commission suggested that Mr. Tolson consider the matter in connection with the Potomac, which is a view of offering desirable projects for a review.

Shipstead-Luce Act map in due time.

9. SUBMISSION BY THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION: Under date of May 5, 1953, a letter was received from Mr. John F. Harbeson, Consulting Architect, of the American Battle Monuments Commission (Exhibit E), recommending that Henry Varnum Poor be appointed as collaborating painter for the American Military Cemetery at Carthage, North Africa.

The matter was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Biddle, who stated that he knew of no painter whom he would consider to be better qualified as painter for the Memorial Chapel at Carthage than Mr. Poor.

Chairman Finley stated that all the members of the Commission know of Mr. Poor's work and that he served as painter member of the Commission of Fine Arts several years ago. Accordingly, the Commission approved the appointment of Mr. Poor for this commission, and Mr. Harbeson was informed accordingly (Exhibit F).

10. RESTORING PAINTINGS: Chairman Finley read the following Memorandum which he received from the Secretary on the subject:

May 13, 1953

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Finley:

Mr. F. S. Hilder of the Public Buildings Management Office (Room 5600 Interior Department) called today for advice regarding a plan to restore some of the paintings of the Government. He said there is not enough money available to employ a "restorer" permanently, but felt that from \$5,000 to \$10,000 could be made available to begin on this project. Three persons have applied:

C. Fritz Hoelzer, Box 333 Gen. Post Office, New York City,
40 years of experience.

Michael Alonzo, 137 East 57th Street, New York City,
firm established 40 years ago.

Harold F. Cross, 1820 Jefferson Place, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Finley said he wished to make inquiry as to the competency of these men, and this was agreeable to the Commission. The importance of the work was recognized. (Exhibit G).

11. **FREER GALLERY OF ART:** The Commission inspected several objects of art as shown by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and approved them (Exhibit H).

12. **MILK DRIVERS' UNION HEADQUARTERS BUILDING:** The Commission were in conference with Leon Chatelain, Architect, during the afternoon, concerning his design for the Milk Drivers' Union Headquarters Building, proposed for erection at the northeast corner of Third Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest.

The Commission informed Mr. Chatelain that the preliminary design submitted at the meeting on April 13th indicated that he intended to give it an expression of monumentality similar to the Municipal Center Building diagonally across the street. Mr. Chatelain said that was true.

Professor Belluschi, speaking for the Commission, said:

"While this preliminary design suggests the type of building that certainly would be acceptable under the norm of what has been done in Washington, D. C., still, we felt that this design was intended to be monumental whereas the building in reality had nothing monumental about it, either in plan or proportions. As a matter of fact, the windows are rather small and I made the comment at the last meeting that, if it had been a less pretentious building and could serve as a background for the more pretentious buildings which are dotting the landscape of Washington, it would be more satisfactory. In my own mind I was thinking of going back to brick, without such a heavy cornice, nor trying to join the three stories into the spandrels, and having perhaps the first floor windows a little larger to give more light; going back to the simplicity of which we have many examples in Washington that are perfectly satisfactory.

"Now, however, to go back to a very plain building does not always mean that it is going to be an improvement. Perhaps there should be a study of variations in size of windows and a very determined study of the texture and color of the brick, and perhaps a little fresher entrance details, and those simpler and crisper details on the cornices and so on; then it would acquire distinction and still preserve simplicity.

"Mr. Peets suggested that we talk to you directly in this fashion, pointing out that we were not prepared to approve the substitution if you were willing to accept a substitution; but that we would not stand in the way of accepting the design submitted if the Union wants that type of building. There are a lot of other buildings of that character in Washington that have been designed and accepted."

Chairman Finley remarked, "Yes, we wanted to ask the question, Did your clients indicate that this is the type of building they wanted so that you were

11. FLEET GALLERY OF ART: The Commission inspected several objects of

as shown by Mr. J. C. Bonney, Director, and approved them (Exhibit H).

12. MILL DRIVE: UNION HANDMADE BUILDING: The Commission were in

conference with Leon Chaselsky, architect, during the afternoon, concerning his

plan for the Mill Drive Union Handmade Building, proposed for erection

the northeast corner of Third Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest.

The Commission advised Mr. Chaselsky that the preliminary design submitted

on August 15th indicated that he intended to give it an expres-

sion of monumentalism similar to the Municipal Center Building diagonally across

street. Mr. Chaselsky said that was true.

Professor Williams, speaking for the Commission, said:

"While this preliminary design suggests the type of building that
certainly will be acceptable under the new plan, it has been done in
Washington, D. C., still, we felt that this design was intended to be
monumental whereas the building in question had nothing monumental
about it, either in plan or in elevation. In a matter of fact, the
windows and other details and I made the comment at the first meeting
that, if it had been a less pretentious building and could serve as a
background for the new Metropolitan Building which is being the
background of Washington, it would be more satisfactory. In my own
mind I was thinking of going back to Paris, without such a heavy cor-
ner, not trying to join the three stories into the square, and
having perhaps the first floor windows a little larger to give more
light, going back to the simplicity of which we have many examples in
Washington that are perfectly satisfactory."

"Now, however, we go back to a very plain building does not at all
mean that it is going to be an improvement. Perhaps there should be
a study of variations in size of windows and a very detailed study
of the balance and color of the building and perhaps a little freedom
in the details, and those simpler and easier details of the corners
and so on; and it could require discussion and still measure up."

Mr. Peets suggested that we talk to you directly in this regard,
pointing out that we were not going to approve the submission if
you were willing to accept a suggestion; but that we would not object
in the way of accepting the design as it is in the Union House plan
type of building. There are a lot of other buildings of this character
in Washington that have been designed and accepted."

Chairman Williams remarked, "Now, we would be very glad to hear from

and indicate that this is the type of building that we are looking for

not free, perhaps, to choose the type that you might have suggested?".

Mr. Chatelain replied:

"No, as I appeared before you the last time, I told you that this was a rather pretentious building for a union of Milk Drivers to have because that is not exactly the style that would go with their type of business operation. You would not expect one of their members to wear afternoon clothes, probably, and things of that sort, and here we are doing the same with the building; I must admit that the building was designed in this character because we thought it would be probably more appropriate for the location or perhaps the type you might approve. I am sure that we can save this Union considerable money by making the building more simple, and I think they would appreciate it. I told them that this so-called monumental style would cost them considerable money."

Mr. Peets said:

"As we were considering the design and arguing back and forth, using this as a point of departure, looking for principles that would bear on the situation, I took the city planning point of view, of course, and said that what we have here is a site which is essentially a background site; it is a setting. In Washington we have quite a large number of monumental locations which are made monumental by the geometry of the city. Those should be architecturally monumental. The others should, if possible, have a commercial or residential scale rather than a large monumental scale; and this building would be doing its part in the city plan, in civic art, if it just had a simple texture of windows and stories such as you find in residential and retail commercial developments; that the door for instance would be simple to indicate that it is part of a general texture of the wall rather than an individually developed special building."

Mr. Chatelain replied:

"I am sure that the owners in this case would be much happier with a building of that type. It would be more suitable to their purpose. We could simplify the design tremendously. It is planned to have stores on one side of the building."

Informed as to the date of the next meeting, June 24, Mr. Chatelain said, "We will have something for you then; we shall give this a new study, and I am very happy to do so because I think it would be more fitting for these people."

The Commission were pleased to hear this, and said they would look forward to seeing Mr. Chatelain at the next meeting with a new design.

free, perhaps, to choose the type that you might have suggested."

Mr. Chatelet replied:

"No, as I appeared before you the last time, I told you that this was a rather pretentious building for a union of Milk Drivers to have because that is not exactly the style that would go with their type of business operation. You would not expect one of their members to wear afternoon clothes, properly, and things of that sort, and here we are doing the same with the building; I must admit that the building was designed in this character because we thought it would be probably more appropriate for the location or perhaps the type you might approve. I am sure that we can save this Union considerable money by making the building more simple, and I think they would appreciate it. I told them that this so-called monumental style would cost them considerable money."

Mr. Peeta said:

"As we were considering the design and arguing back and forth, raising this as a point of departure, looking for principles that would bear on the situation, I took the city planning point of view, of course, and said that what we have here is a site which is essentially a background site; it is a setting. In Washington we have quite a large number of monumental locations which are made monumental by the geometry of the city. Those should be architecturally monumental. The others should, if possible, have a commercial or residential scale rather than a large monumental scale; and this building would be doing its part in the city plan, in civic art, if it just had a simple texture of windows and stories such as you find in residential and retail commercial developments; that the color for instance would be simple to indicate that it is part of a general texture of the wall rather than an individually developed special building."

Mr. Chatelet replied:

"I am sure that the owners in this case would be much happier with a building of that type. It would be more suitable to their purpose. We could simplify the design tremendously. It is planned to have stories on one side of the building."

Informed as to the date of the next meeting, June 24, Mr. Chatelet

and, "We will have something for you then; we shall give this a new study, and

in very happy to do so because I think it would be more fitting for these

ple."

The Commission were pleased to hear this, and said they would look forward

seeing Mr. Chatelet at the next meeting with a new design.

13. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: A contemplated trip to inspect certain projects under construction, such as the East Capitol Street Bridge, and new buildings at the Army Medical Center and the Soldiers' Home had to be postponed, because of a considerable number of Shipstead-Luce Act submissions that required the attention of the Commission (Exhibit I).

14. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION: The Commission decided to hold their next meeting in Washington on Wednesday, June 24, 1953.

The Commission adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

13. SHIPBOARD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: A contemplated trip to inspect certain projects under construction, such as the East Capitol Street Bridge, and buildings at the Army Medical Center and the Soldiers' Home had to be postponed, because of a considerable number of Shipboard-Luce Act submissions required the attention of the Commission (Exhibit I).
14. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION: The Commission decided to hold their meeting in Washington on Wednesday, June 24, 1953.

The Commission adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

C O P Y

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ARTS
1083 Fifth Avenue
New York 28, N. Y.

April 28, 1953

Dear Member:

Today the May issue of MAGAZINE OF ART is being mailed to you. As the Editorial will announce, with this issue MAGAZINE OF ART is unfortunately obliged to suspend publication.

As a member of The American Federation of Arts, you have been receiving, as one of your membership privileges, MAGAZINE OF ART, which the AFA has published continuously since 1909.

We are happy to tell you, however, that we have concluded arrangements with The Art Foundation, Inc., publishers of ART NEWS, which will enable us to send you ART NEWS, instead, during the period of your membership. This will become effective with the June issue of ART NEWS.

Much as we regret the necessity for suspending publication of MAGAZINE OF ART, we feel confident that your enjoyment of the world of art will continue to be enhanced by receiving ART NEWS, since 1902 one of America's leading periodicals.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
BURTON CUMMING
Director

P.S. If you are already a subscriber to ART NEWS, ART NEWS will shortly write to you extending to you the privilege of designating someone to receive the copies still due you on the unexpired portion of your current ART NEWS subscription.

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ARTS
1083 Fifth Avenue
New York 28, N. Y.

April 28, 1953

Dear Madam:

Today the May issue of MAGAZINE OF ART is being mailed to you. As the Editorial will announce, with this issue MAGAZINE OF ART is unfortunately obliged to suspend publication.

As a member of The American Federation of Arts, you have been receiving, as one of your membership privileges, MAGAZINE OF ART, which the AFA has published continuously since 1904.

We are happy to tell you, however, that we have concluded arrangements with The Art Foundation, Inc., publisher of ART NEWS, which will enable us to send you ART NEWS instead, during the period of your membership. This will become effective with the June issue of ART NEWS.

Much as we regret the necessity for suspending publication of MAGAZINE OF ART, we feel confident that your exposure to the world of art will continue to be enhanced by receiving ART NEWS, since 1902 one of America's leading periodicals.

Sincerely yours,

36.
HUTTON CUMMINS
Director

P.S. If you are already a subscriber to ART NEWS, ART NEWS will shortly write to you explaining to you the privilege of designating someone to receive the copies still due you on the unexpired portion of your current ART NEWS subscription.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

H. J. RES. 211

May 15, 1953

Dear Mr. Crim:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts which was held on May 15th, I brought to their attention your letter to me of April 29th enclosing a letter from Mr. Mihran N. Costikyan, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York, together with a photograph in color and a brochure regarding a "Portrait of General Washington at Princeton with Nassau Hall in the Background," attributed to Charles Willson Peale, which Mr. Costikyan hopes may be accepted as a gift to The White House if presented by a donor agreeable to the President. Mr. Costikyan in his letter does not identify the proposed donor.

After viewing the photograph, the Commission recommend that the portrait be not accepted for The White House, particularly as the donor is not identified.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. H. G. Crim
Chief Usher
The White House

DEF/amv

cc: Mr. Caemmerer, Sec., Commission of Fine Arts

EXHIBIT B

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 211

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 5, 1953

Mr. SCUDDER introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

JOINT RESOLUTION

To direct the Administrator of General Services to remove the mural paintings from the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco, California.

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House Committee on Public Works that the mural paintings decorating the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco, California, have been criticized by civic groups, veterans' organizations, and patriotic and fraternal societies, as well as by local newspapers and numerous individuals, as being artistically offensive and historically inaccurate; and

Whereas the murals cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers and the history of the great State of California: Therefore be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled.*
3 That the Administrator of General Services shall take such
4 action as may be necessary for the prompt removal of the
5 mural paintings on the lobby walls of the Rincon Annex
6 Post Office Building in San Francisco, California.

83d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 211

JOINT RESOLUTION

To direct the Administrator of General Services
to remove the mural paintings from the
lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office Build-
ing in San Francisco, California.

By Mr. SCUDDER

MARCH 5, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

FOGGY BOTTON DEVELOPMENT

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Nolen, I believe you are to open with a statement about this new development.

MR. NOLEN: I do not know what I can contribute to the situation right at the moment. This proposal which concerns the gas company property which is what I understand you are interested in, has come to us through Chester Churchill of New York who is representing the Potomac Parkway Plaza Development Company, the same address as Harris Associates, R. W. Harris Associates. They have presented some plans which I presume that you have seen which show a multi-story building way above any zoning height limits permitted even by Act of Congress in Washington. The development is quite expensive. It involves a large hotel and we are currently reviewing that with them to see if there is any basis of an agreement before they proceed to secure legislation necessary for the development.

Now, whether we are successful in persuading them to do something other than that which they have proposed is an open question. I am not passing any judgment on it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Are they asking for legislation to extend the height?

MR. NOLEN: They are not asking yet. My point is that they would have to if they proposed to go ahead with this development.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I assume you would recommend against it?

MR. NOLEN: The Commission has taken no action on it yet.

MR. PEETS: Would you say what the difference would be, the number of feet, the height of the building as comparing the present legal limits with what they are asking?

MR. NOLEN: You mean what could they do if they kept within the limits? I have not an exact comparison on that. I have not made an analysis of it. It is quite technical. Their apartment building is 235 feet in height. The apartment building in Washington is limited to 90 feet if it is in a residential district but if it is in a commercial district, it can go up to 130 feet.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would that make it visible from the Lincoln Memorial and the Mall?

MR. NOLEN: Oh, yes, it would be nearly half as high as the Washington Monument, 235 feet against 555.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The limit then -- the Lincoln --

MR. NOLEN: The Lincoln Memorial has an elevation, has absolute elevation above sea level of 140 feet. That would be nearly 100 feet higher. It would be more than that because this height is measured from the ground, not from sea level. It is commercial buildings, they have hotel plans, the hotel is about 1000 rooms, about the size of the Statler.

Also, they have a number of office buildings planned. The office buildings they have planned are rather considerable. They extend over a wide area and considerable height.

In order to undertake the office building development, they would have to have the same zoning as is required or as exists in the downtown central business district. In other words, they would be departing from the basic zoning plan which concentrates, which is generally regarded as proper, the intensive development in one contiguous area. They would be building up a competing area over here of the same, permitting the same height and intensity of development as in the downtown business district.

I have told them that there are enough things going on around the fringe of Washington so that once that basic principle was broken down, there would be other requests undoubtedly for establishing intensive commercial districts outside the central business district. The end result of such a policy would be, well, I can leave that to your imaginations.

The land values downtown run up to \$40 and \$50 a square foot. Land values here at the gas company property are perhaps a tenth of the value downtown yet they would have the same privilege of intensive development there under their proposal.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They propose to eliminate the gas company tanks?

MR. NOLEN: Eventually, yes. They are not acquiring

also, they have a number of office buildings planned. The
office buildings they have planned are rather considerable.
They extend over a wide area and cover a large

In order to undertake the office building develop-
ment, they would have to have the same amount of land as they
or as exists in the downtown central business district. In
other words, they would be dealing with the same kind of
land which commercial, which is generally regarded as
prime, the intensive development is one of the same kind.
They would be building up a commercial area over part of the
area, converting the same kind of land into a commercial
as in the downtown business district.

I have told them that there are about three acres
or around the fringe of Washington so that once that date
the area was broken down, there would be other parcels
available for residential intensive commercial districts
outside the central business district. The land would be used
a better would be, well, I am saying that the land would be
The land value would be up to \$10 and that a
square foot. Land value says at the same time, however, that
represents a part of the value downtown but they would be in the
same vicinity of intensive development where there is

proposed.

CHAIRMAN: They propose to purchase the

the company owned?

MR. HOLLER: Eventually, yes, they are not acquiring

the gas company tank property at the present time. Their proposal is limited only to the gas company property which has been cleared.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: South of Virginia Avenue?

MR. NOLEN: They have one piece of property north of Virginia Avenue not occupied by tanks which they could use.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: At what stage is their plan now? Is it before your Commission for a recommendation?

MR. NOLEN: Yes, they have appeared before the Commission several times and the Commission asked them to submit a statement more definitely in outlining what they propose. They have done that and it was referred to the Executive Committee and I have been waiting for the opportunity to have a meeting with the Executive Committee, which I understand they are ready to have now.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Well, for our own information and guidance, would you be willing to indicate generally how the Commission looks upon this development in this area?

MR. NOLEN: I would not hazard a guess right now, Mr. Finley.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You have not got that far?

MR. BELLUSCHI: Can't we guess on our part?

MR. PEETS: If you were to hazard guesses today --

MR. NOLEN: Mr. Peets knows something about some of our problem.

MR. PEETS: Would you hazard a guess to what the East

River crowd would say about it?

MR. NOLEN: I do not know. That river report is in the doldrums right now: nobody is taking it too seriously.

MR. PEETS: There is the economy objective.

MR. NOLEN: The people who fathered that report are off on another subject now. There is no sponsor for it.

MR. PEETS: I would not ask you what Tracy would feel about this proposition because we know without asking him.

MR. NOLEN: This is just the height of buildings in the central business district. I think the significant thing about it is that the area allocated for high buildings is quite ample as indicated by that map. Only about ten percent of the area has been built up to the permitted limit: it shows a tendency to converge around the White House.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The first step it would take is to have the property rezoned for business purposes.

MR. NOLEN: Not only for business but to secure greater height, too.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That would permit greater height, if it were rezoned for business.

MR. NOLEN: In order to do whatever they are proposing would require legislation.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: When that point is reached we will both be asked for opinions, the two Commissions, I assume.

MR. NOLEN: It could be.

I think our Commission and The Fine Arts Commission should prepare an opinion on this matter and do it as early as possible. People are investors, they make their commitments and it is only fair to them, if there is to be opposition to some phase of the plan or the plan as a whole, whatever it may be, and I think it should be known early.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They have the site. They have secured the site?

MR. NOLEN: They have options on it, yes.

MR. PEETS: We made the suggestion that, to Churchill that to prepare drawings showing his proposed buildings and extending it over to the Lincoln Memorial, it is not much but it would give the feelings as to the dominancy.

MR. NOLEN: This building out here is 90 feet high on Virginia Avenue. It would be two and a half times as high as that.

MR. PEETS: Do you know how high the Hunting Creek group is?

MR. NOLEN: 90 to 100 feet.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You do not suppose that the full Commission is too premature in making their position, but if they are determined, it might encourage them to go around politically and get individual Congressmen to pass it.

MR. NOLEN: That is always a possibility. They have

that privilege, you might say. But I think my own experience here in Washington is that if someone has a stake in something, the bigger the stake, the more determined they are to overcome obstacles. The mistakes that have been made in planning Washington have been many, have been because the agencies that were concerned with the result were never consulted early enough to have any influence. Nevertheless, they might just as well not resist. It is superfluous.

Our new Planning Act recognized that basic principle and it specifically provides that the developmental agencies shall submit plans in their initial and successive stages to the commissions so as to see preliminary sketches. I am sure Mr. Hunter would agree with me that every time we have been able to, Public Buildings, has had some new project, to get together on the initial sketch stages, we usually work the thing out successfully, the odds are 99 to 1, but then the thing gets along to the final drawings, it is too late to do anything. It is very difficult then.

MR. PEETS: Churchill let us see some plans but he carefully explained they were not the plans, did not in every case say that those were tentative and it was going to be some other way and that sort of thing.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What is before either commission now on which we could express ourselves?

MR. NOLEN: He has submitted a statement of what their

proposal is. It gives areas of buildings and densities and mostly statistical material, number of occupants, car spaces and so on so we could analyze the plan. He is ready now and we are ready to confer with him at Commission level and we are trying to arrange such a meeting now. I presume the Fine Arts Commission's interest in this comes in under your general interest in what actually specifically and legally is under the Shipstead Act.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Shipstead-Luce Act as to the height and so on and then the design of the building would come to us.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Can we go on record as being opposed to it?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Opposed to the development of the area in any way?

MR. BELLUSCHI: To the height, to go up to that height.

MR. NEILD: Has it been definitely determined that there is any height of that sort? We know nothing about it. Nothing has been submitted except in a general way. Can we make approval or disapproval?

MR. NOLEN: Did they not submit to you elevations?

MR. PEETS: Yes, but no schedule on it. It did not indicate the height. We never heard such a figure as 255 feet.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Caemmerer, we have nothing before us on which we have --

MR. CAEMMERER: Just the newspapers and they said

the publicity was premature and they regretted it, that sort of thing.

MR. PEETS: But Churchill came here and several people with him and sort of -- we could ask him to submit material similar to that which he submitted the Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Ask him to submit the same material he submitted to the Planning Commission and then we would keep in touch with you and find out what your reaction is. I do not see anything more to do at this moment.

MR. NOLEN: This material submitted to us, I do not see why it should not, it may be helpful, I do not know. It is abstracts, like an engineering report. Visually it is nothing, but it gives facts on which we can make a study as to intensity of development and how it compares to what is under existing zoning.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: When you have come to a conclusion, I suppose you could forward it to us and ask for our comments, if you like, or Mr. Caemmerer could ask these people to submit them, the material to us, that you are studying now, which would be the most expeditious way of handling it.

MR. NOLEN: See what result comes out of it. You understood what I said first, Mr. Finley, that what we are trying to do is sit down with these people around the table and amicably get a meeting of minds so far as possible. I am not saying whether we will or not but that is our present

6/22/17

Jun 15, 2

July 1
CFA
U.S. C
[30]
34
Jun 1
8

The committee has reviewed the report submitted by the

of this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee has reviewed the report

with him and with the committee and with the committee

similar to that which is submitted by the committee

CHAIRMAN: The committee has reviewed the report

submitted by the committee and with the committee

and in fact with you and find that your report is

in fact not anything more to be at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This material submitted to me, I do not

see any of it and it is not in fact, I do not know. It

is a report, like an engineering report, usually in a

report, but it gives facts and figures and it is not

an account of development and it is not a report on what is

under existing order.

CHAIRMAN: Now we have come to a conclusion

I suppose you would demand it so as not to be

it is not, in fact, a report and it is not a report on what

is, the report is not, that you are stating now, with

and in fact a report on what is

MR. CHAIRMAN: The report would seem to be, that

submitted and I said that, Mr. Chairman, that report is not

trying to do it all over again, that is what the report

and it is not a report of what is to be done, it is

not a report of what is to be done, it is a report

stage of negotiating. We did not want to come out in the open and say we are against this. We certainly are not for it without finding out what it meant. It is tied up with the E Street Bridge question.

I have a statement from them that they would regard, back last fall, it was; they may have changed their position on it a little bit now but they said then that they thought that the E Street Bridge would adversely affect this project. In my opinion, it would, too.

You can't put a development of that intensity right at the bridgehead and do anything but get in trouble.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I was under the impression that it was suggested unofficially, verbally, that they wanted to go up to 225 feet. As a preliminary expression of this Commission, I think certainly they ought to know that we are not in favor of that. That is all I wanted to say except that in breaking that rule that you, in fact, would be doing something extraordinary.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it might strengthen your hand in consultation with them, give them a warning that this Commission is not likely to approve anything above the established height. So they ought to make thier preliminary plans based on that.

MR. NOLEN: It is the kind of thing we could have good teamwork on.

of the... We are not... and we are... without... E. H. ...

I have a statement... back last... is a little... the 5... my opinion, it would...

You can't... at the... Mr. ... was... we... situation, I... in favor of... is... could... could...

... I think... based on...

... It is the... research on...

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is that the sense of the Commission?

Apparently everyone agrees.

I suppose you will keep in touch with us as you talk with them and then when it reaches the stage where we would be involved, why, we would appreciate it if you would let us know.

MR. NOLEN: I will be glad to.

MR. PEETS: That closes that matter. There was also the point that we were going to discuss, I believe, as to whether it would be desirable to extend the Shipstead-Luce protection to your new purchases of land along the Potomac River, particularly within the District.

MR. CAEMMERER: We have had no maps since 1939.

MR. PEETS: We had a letter of indignation concerning some houses that were built close to part of that strip of park and that brought up the question of whether Shipstead-Luce applies to that and we had to say it is public park, the Shipstead-Luce Act does not apply to it because it is not specifically mentioned in there and --

MR. NOLEN: I am not clear exactly which section you are talking about. We did extend the Shipstead-Luce Act twice, I think, made new maps. We got the legislation amended, you remember.

MR. PEETS: In case you had to get legislation to cover it --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is there the name of the gentleman?

Accordingly everyone agrees.

I suppose you will keep in touch with us as you wish
with him and then when it reaches the stage where we would be
involved, well, we would appreciate it if you would let us
know.

MR. KOLLMER: I will be glad to.

MR. FINLEY: That is all that we need. There was also
the point that we were going to discuss, I believe, as to
whether it would be desirable to extend the minimum wage
protection to your new establishment and also the former plant,
particularly within the district.

MR. KOLLMER: We have had no case since 1934.

MR. FINLEY: We had a letter of inquiry after consultation
and found that there will also be part of that plant of which
we had brought up the question of whether minimum wage
applies to that and we had to say it is not. Well, the
Shipyard-Plant has been not apply so it seems it is not
specifically mentioned in there and --

MR. KOLLMER: I am not clear exactly which section you
are talking about. We did extend the minimum wage but twice,
I think, made one more. We got the legislation amended, for

continued.

MR. FINLEY: In case you had to get legislation to

MR. NOLEN: But the legislation is pretty broad and the map can be extended within limits of that broad scope.

MR. PEETS: Is that so?

MR. NOLEN: Yes, all it takes is joint action by our Commission and the District Commissioners. We prepare the map and they have to approve it. We have amended the map several times. The Northwest rectangle has been expanded.

I am not familiar with this.

MR. CAEMMERER: About 42nd Street.

MR. NEILD: Do we actually have jurisdiction and did not know it?

MR. CAEMMERER: You mean amending the map?

MR. NEILD: Was this not submitted to us and we said we had nothing to do with it because it was not in the Shipstead-Luce territory?

MR. PEETS: It did not come from the District Government as it normally does. Legally, we are required to review it.

MR. CAEMMERER: There was no present authority and of course these houses are about completed, but it was the Commission's thought at the last meeting that, to prevent similar occurrence, it might be well to take it up with the National Capital Planning Commission to amend the map.

MR. NEILD: That is what I am driving at. Did we have the authority at that time?

THE HOUSE: For the purpose of the bill, the

the bill can be amended at any time.

MR. BROWN: In that case

MR. BROWN: Yes, off it goes in that case.

Committee and the House. (Laughter.)

and that case in section 11. He has not yet been

closed. The House will not be

I am not familiar with it.

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

MR. BROWN: He is not yet

and that is

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

we have nothing to do with it. It is not

that is the case.

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

that is the case. (Laughter.)

11

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

there is no doubt about it.

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

MR. BROWN: Yes, that is

MR. CAEMMERER: Not at present.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you like to consider then, extending the authority of the Shipstead-Luce Act?

MR. NOLEN: We would be very glad to. I would be very glad to present it to the Commission. I would like to have from you what areas you think ought to be included. To go out as far as this would require amendment of the Act. I would say, just off-hand, that the climate is not too favorable for amending the Shipstead-Luce Act to this extent: the interest is the other way.

MR. PEETS: You are purchasing land along the Potomac in the District, are you not.

MR. NOLEN: Yes.

MR. PEETS: That is going to be permanent park. Would you not like the protection, such protection as the Shipstead-Luce Act gives you to keep, for instance, very old buildings from lining up the edge of the park?

MR. NOLEN: Of course the park areas of the City, and they are all part of the system of parks, permeate the whole fabric of the City. If you are going to talk about main extremes or all the little reservations?

MR. PEETS: That is what we are talking about.

MR. NOLEN: If you feel strongly about some particular phase of it, why don't you present it to the Commission? Certainly discuss it and maybe have a joint discussion of it

and come to some kind of conclusion whether legislation is necessary or not. It can be. As I indicated earlier, some extension under existing legislation is possible. How extensive that is, I do not know.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Peets, would you like to present, prepare a study which this Commission might consider at the next meeting of the extension that you think would be desirable and then we could consider whether or not to send them to the Planning Commission with the idea that they might be extended under the present law or perhaps an amendment should be requested from Congress?

MR. PEETS: I might be able week after next to spend one hour talking about the subject.

MR. NOLEN: All right.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Suppose we leave it at that. We will have some ideas. We will get them to you and if they require amendment of the Act we can consider whether it is advisable.

MR. NOLEN: Very good. The kind of thing that would not require amendment of the Act, I think, such a thing as the Potomac Park. I do not think we ever included the area across Washington channel. We could probably do that without additional authority.

MR. PEETS: A little section at the War College?

MR. NOLEN: On the map now?

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes.

MR. NOLEN: Yes, maybe.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you include this part in Virginia across Roosevelt Island?

MR. NOLEN: Only in the District of Columbia?

MR. de WELDON: What is the status of the E Street Bridge, do you know?

MR. NOLEN: I wish I knew. All I know is what we read in the papers and this little article in the news sort of indicates the general trend of events. As far as I know that project is a bonafide project, a \$25 million project, reported to be the largest FHA insured project in the country.

MR. de WELDON: You refer to the housing project?

MR. NOLEN: This is right across the Virginia approach to the bridge, occupies the whole network of roads, to make the bridge practical.

MR. de WELDON: The Theodore Roosevelt Island Memorial Association was very much opposed to it, the E Street Bridge.

MR. NOLEN: I know, but the District Highway Department has not been concerned with that opposition. They say they are ready to meet it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: There is a legal question involved there, is there not?

MR. NOLEN: That is right.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The amount that would have to be

THE PRESIDENT

MR. WILSON

THE PRESIDENT

THE PRESIDENT

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

THE PRESIDENT

MR. WILSON

THE PRESIDENT

MR. WILSON

THE PRESIDENT

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

MR. WILSON

decided by the courts.

MR. NOLEN: Congress can change the law.

MR. de WELDON: Cannot make it retroactive.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If the Roosevelt Association has certain rights in that island, it might present a very difficult situation.

MR. NOLEN: All I am telling you is what the District people say. They are not concerned about that at all. This apparently is a very real thing and they apparently realize they have got to reckon with that. It is a physical obstacle.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You were considering other bridges in other locations?

MR. NOLEN: We have considered many bridge sites. The Commission asked us to study every conceivable site that made any sense, would have some valid service to the central area, either directly or indirectly by the diversion of traffic. We have studied, oh, I guess, a dozen sites down the river, between the two outer crossings, between Nebraska Avenue and the Alexandria Bridge, one below Highway Bridge, two alternate locations below Highway Bridge, immediately below the Railroad Bridge, Constitution Avenue location, G and H Street location, New Hampshire Avenue location, and two locations immediately below Key Bridge and about four above Key Bridge. Those are exploratory, simply to see on small scale diagrams, merely to see what the problems were

Mr. [Name] [Address] [City] [State] [Zip]

Dear Mr. [Name]:

I am writing to you to inform you of the results of the

survey conducted in your area. The results are as follows:

1. [Point 1]

2. [Point 2]

3. [Point 3]

4. [Point 4]

5. [Point 5]

6. [Point 6]

7. [Point 7]

8. [Point 8]

9. [Point 9]

10. [Point 10]

11. [Point 11]

12. [Point 12]

13. [Point 13]

14. [Point 14]

15. [Point 15]

16. [Point 16]

17. [Point 17]

18. [Point 18]

19. [Point 19]

20. [Point 20]

and whether a location at these particular points were practical in relieving the traffic situation.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I assume your interest in preservation of Roosevelt Island is the same as ours, we would not like to see park lands invaded. I think that is a matter we can let go for another morning.

MR. NOLEN: They have not taken the position on Roosevelt Island per se, has not said they opposed that. The Park Service has.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that has not been brought to us for any recommendation yet. There has been no proposal in any stage for the bridge crossing Roosevelt Island that has come to us for a recommendation.

MR. CAEMMERER: I heard that the Engineer Commissioner asked for restudy.

MR. NOLEN: As a result of this proposal, yes.

MR. de WELDON: General Grant testified before us on behalf of the Roosevelt Memorial.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And the Roosevelt Memorial Association appeared before us and opposed it. I think they will oppose it but we have not taken any position.

That is all we have this morning. Thank you very much, Mr. Nolen.

(Exit Mr. Nolen.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Is there someone waiting now about

and always a location of these particular points were made.

and in relation to the results obtained.

THESE RESULTS: I cannot give answers to the questions

of the committee and in the same way, we would not like to

see any other results. I think that in a subject we can get

the best results possible.

MR. HODGE: They have not given any results on

the subject of the committee, but they have given some results.

THESE RESULTS: I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

the best results possible. I think that we have not given

C O P Y

HARBESON HOUGH LIVINGSTON & LARSON
1510 Architects Building
Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania

May 5, 1953

Re: BATTLE MONUMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. C. Paul Caemmerer, Secretary
National Fine Arts Commission
Interior Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

The Architects for the Carthage project of Battle Monuments Commission, Moore and Hutchins of New York, propose for their painter collaborator for this project Henry Varnum Poor, New City, Rockland County, New York. The painter's work for this Memorial is principally the design of the historical battle maps; it has been agreed by the architects and Battle Monuments Commission that these are to be realized at the Carthage project in tiles.

Henry Varnum Poor has had considerable experience in ceramic work and has won a number of prizes for his work in this medium. The architects have agreed to cooperate in the matter of lettering and accurate drafting of topographic outlines. I endorse their choice.

Enclosed is a statement of Mr. Poor's education, experience and some of his honors.

Under separate cover we send you an exhibit of Mr. Poor's work, consisting of photographs and two magazine articles. There are twelve frescoes by him in the Justice Building and a large mural, "Conservation of American Wild Life" in the Department of Interior Building, Washington, D. C.

You may remember that Mr. Poor's name was one of three recommended by the Fine Arts Commission for consideration as Painter Collaborator for the St. Laurent project. (For that project Leon Kroll, another of the three, was chosen to design the mosaic ceiling of the Chapel.)

Please let me know if further information or exhibits are needed.

Very sincerely yours,

Sincerely,

Sgd.
John Harbeson

JH/b
cc: General Thomas North
Encl.

EXHIBIT E

HARRISON ROBERT LIVINGSTON & LARSON
1510 Archibute Building
Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania

May 2, 1952

Re: BATTLE MONUMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. C. Paul Casper, Secretary
National Fine Arts Commission
Interior Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Casper:

The Architects for the Overseas project of Battle Monuments Foundation, Messrs. and Mrs. of New York, propose for their painter collaborator for this project Henry Varum Poor, New City, Rockland County, New York. The painter's work for this Memorial is principally the design of the historical battle maps; it has been agreed by the architects and Battle Monuments Commission that these are to be realized at the Overseas project in office.

Henry Varum Poor has had considerable experience in ceramic work and has won a number of prizes for his work in this medium. The architects have agreed to cooperate in the matter of lettering and accurate drafting of topographic outlines. I endorse their choice.

Enclosed is a statement of Mr. Poor's education, experience and some of his honors.

Under separate cover we send you an exhibit of Mr. Poor's work, consisting of photographs and two magazine articles. There are twelve trassces for him in the Justice Building and a large mural, "Conservation of American Wild Life" in the Department of Interior Building, Washington, D. C.

You may remember that Mr. Poor's name was one of those recommended by the Fine Arts Commission for consideration as Painter Collaborator for the 50. I am not project. (For that project see Brief, another of the three, was chosen to design the mosaic ceiling of the Chapel.)

Please let us know if further information or exhibits are needed.

Very sincerely yours,

Sincerely,

John Larson

cc: General Thomas Norton
Encl.

C O P Y

Henry Varnum Poor

Born Chapman, Kansas, 1888, Scotch-Irish and English ancestry. Graduate Stanford University 1910. Studied London and Paris. Returned to teach drawing and painting at Stanford University 1913 to 1916. Professor at California School of Fine Arts. San Francisco 1917-1918.

Held two one man shows in San Francisco.

Served in World War I 1919-20, in 110 Engineers, as Regimental Artist. After war, moved East, settled in Rockland County, New York. Held one man exhibition in New York and started making ceramics.

Since 1921 has held many one man shows at Montrose and Rehn Galleries, New York. Represented by paintings and ceramics in most major Museums in U. S.

Decorations in Tile- Ceiling of the Union Dime Savings Bank, New York. Tile Murals- Branch Post Office, Chicago; Post Office, Fresno, California.

Fresco Murals- 12 Panels in rotundas at Attorney General's Offices in Department of Justice Building, Washington, D. C. Large Fresco 50'X8' in New Department of the Interior Building, Washington D. C.

Complete Fresco Project around mezzanine floor and foyer of the Main Administration Building, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania.

Large Fresco on Kentucky themes in foyer of the new Courier-Journal Building, Louisville, Kentucky.

In World War II, helped organize the War Arts Program and went to Alaska as head of the Unit for that Theater of War.

Served on Commission of Fine Arts 1940-44.

President of Skowhegan School of Painting and Sculpture 1946 to present.

Artist in Residence, American Academy in Rome 1950.

Visiting Professor at Columbia University.

Medal of Honor Architectural League, New York, 1938.

Two 1st Prizes Syracuse National Ceramic Exhibition.

Logan Medal for Design and Craftsmanship, Chicago.

Awards at Carnegie International, Penna. Academy and other National Exhibitions.

Member of National Institute of Arts and Letters.

Author of Book - "Artist Sees Alaska" - Viking Press 1946.

Henry Vannum Poor

Born Chapman, Kansas, 1888, Scotch-Irish and English ancestry. Graduate Stanford University 1910. Studied London and Paris. Returned to teach drawing and painting at Stanford University 1913 to 1916. Professor at California School of Fine Arts, San Francisco 1917-1918.

Held two one man shows in San Francisco.

Served in World War I 1917-20, in LHO Engineers, as Regimental Artist. After war, moved East, settled in Rockland County, New York. Held one man exhibition in New York and started making ceramics.

Since 1921 has held many one man shows at Montrose and Fern Galleries, New York. Represented by paintings and ceramics in most major Museums in U. S.

Decorations in Title - Ceiling of the Union Die Savings Bank, New York, Title Murals - Branch Post Office, Chicago; Post Office, Fresno, California.

Presco Murals - 12 Panels in rotunda at Attorney General's Offices in Department of Justice Building, Washington, D. C. Large Presco 20' x 18' in New Department of the Interior Building, Washington D. C.

Complete Presco Project around messamine floor and foyer of the Administration Building, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania.

Large Presco on Kentucky Shores in foyer of the new Governor-Journal Building, Louisville, Kentucky.

In World War II, helped organize the War Arts Program and went to Alaska as head of the Unit for that Theater of War.

Served on Commission of Fine Arts 1940-44.

President of Showmen School of Painting and Sculpture 1946 to present.

Artist in Residence, American Academy in Rome 1950.

Visiting Professor at Columbia University.

Medal of Honor Architectural League, New York, 1958.

Two 1st Prizes Syracuse National Ceramic Exhibition.

1st Prize Medal for Best in Ceramic and Pottery, Chicago.

Member of Carnegie International, Paris, Academy and other National Exhibitions.

Member of National Institute of Arts and Letters.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

May 18, 1953

Dear Mr. Harbeson:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting held on May 15, 1953, approved the recommendation, as contained in your letter of May 5, that Henry Varnum Poor be appointed as painter collaborator for the memorial proposed by the American Battle Monuments Commission at Carthage, Africa.

The photographs, which you submitted, of Mr. Poor's work are returned herewith.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. John Harbeson,
Harbeson Hough Livingston & Larson,
1510 Architects Building,
Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania.

Enclosures 4

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

May 18, 1953

Dear Mr. Harbeson:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting held on
May 15, 1953, approved the recommendation, as contained in
your letter of May 5, that Henry Vernon Poor be appointed
as painter collaborator for the memorial proposed by the
American Battle Monuments Commission at Carlsberg, France.
The photographs, which you submitted, of Mr. Poor's
work are retained herewith.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David H. Bailey,
Chairman.

Mr. John Harbeson,
Harbeson Hough Livingston & Harbeson,
1510 Arch Street Building,
Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania.

Enclosures 4

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

June 5, 1953

Dear Mr. Hilder:

At a recent meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts Mr. Caemmerer told us of your request for advice regarding a plan for the restoration of some of the paintings and particularly some of the mural paintings, which are the property of the United States Government.

I understand that sufficient funds are not available to employ a restorer on a permanent basis but that it may be possible to make from \$5,000 to \$10,000 available to begin the work on a contract basis. I also understand that you have had three applications for this work as follows: Mr. C. Fritz Hoelzer, Mr. Michael Alonzo, and Mr. Harold F. Cross.

I regret that I am not familiar with the work of Mr. Hoelzer and Mr. Alonzo and cannot make any recommendations concerning them. I know Mr. Cross personally and understand from Mr. Hermann Williams, Director of the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, that when Mr. Cross maintained a restoration studio in the Corcoran Gallery, the work was satisfactory. I have also received favorable reports about Mr. Cross' work from other sources.

I might add that Mr. Francis Sullivan, who is Consultant Restorer on a contract basis at the National Gallery of Art, would like to be considered for this work. Mr. Sullivan has asked me to forward an estimate of the charges which he would make for the restoration of the fresco paintings, which I understand are most in need of attention. He would associate in this work Mr. Stephen Story of New York who, as well as Mr. Sullivan, was for a long time in the employ of the late Mr. Stephen Pichetto, a well-known restorer in New York with offices in the Squibb Building. Both Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Story are competent restorers, and I would be glad to recommend they also be taken under consideration for restoration work on a contract basis.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. F. S. Hilder
Public Buildings Management Office
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

DEF/amv

cc: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Sec., Commission of Fine Arts,

COFA - Misc.

EXHIBIT G

PRIMA CLASSE DI ACCADEMICO LICEO
PRIMA CLASSE DI ACCADEMICO LICEO
PRIMA CLASSE DI ACCADEMICO LICEO

2000

2001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

- 1 Red lacquer box with cover. Chinese, Ming dynasty, Hsüan-tê period.
- 1 Lacquer writing box. Japanese, 17th century. Made by Kajikawa.
- 1 Blue and white porcelain bowl. Chinese, Ming dynasty, Chêng Tê period.
- 1 Blue and white porcelain bowl, melon design. Chinese, Early Ming dynasty.
- 1 Blue and white porcelain bowl, grape design. Chinese, Early Ming dynasty.
- 1 White porcelain bowl. Chinese, Ming dynasty, Yung-lo period.
- 1 Aubergine porcelain bowl, dragon design. Chinese, Ch'ing dynasty, K'ang Hsi period.
- 1 White porcelain bottle-shaped vase. Chinese, Ch'ing dynasty, K'ang Hsi period.
- 1 Famille rose mille fleur porcelain bottle-shaped vase. Chinese, Ch'ing dynasty, Ch'ien Lung period.
- 1 Pottery vase with lid. Chinese, T'ang dynasty. San Ts'ai ware.
- 1 Pottery Temmoku bowl. Chinese, Sung dynasty.
- 1 Page from the manuscript, Yusuf and Suleikha, with marginal decorations of ibex and birds in gold. Persian, mid-16th century.
- 1 Kakemono painting, Chinese, Yüan dyn., by Wu Chên.
- 1 Page from the manuscript, Yusuf and Suleikha, with marginal decorations of lion, bull, ibex and birds in gold. Persian, mid-16th century.
- 1 Page from the manuscript, Yusuf and Suleikha, with marginal decorations of lions and birds in gold. Persian, mid-16th century.
- 1 Page from the manuscript, Yusuf and Suleikha, with marginal decorations of tiger and deer in gold. Persian, mid-16th century.

THE COMMISSION OF THE ARTS

the Agents of the Smithsonian Institution, the Commission of the Arts, and
as Katherine H. Brundage, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4
the Catalog to the Hall of the Lane Charles L. Tress, have examined the

Following objects:

1 Red lacquer box with cover. Chinese, Ming dynasty, K'ang-hsi period.

1 Lacquer writing box. Japanese, 17th century. Made by Kajiya.

1 Blue and white porcelain bowl. Chinese, Ming dynasty, Cheng-te period.

1 Blue and white porcelain bowl, melon design. Chinese, Early Ming
dynasty.

1 Blue and white porcelain bowl, grape design. Chinese, Early Ming
dynasty.

1 White porcelain bowl. Chinese, Ming dynasty, Yong-lo period.

1 Amberine porcelain bowl, dragon design. Chinese, Ch'ing dynasty,
K'ang Hsi period.

1 White porcelain bottle-shaped vase. Chinese, Ch'ing dynasty,
K'ang Hsi period.

1 Famille rose white porcelain bottle-shaped vase. Chinese,
Ch'ing dynasty, Ch'ien lung period.

1 Pottery vase with lid. Chinese, Tang dynasty. San Tsai ware.

1 Pottery T'ang ware bowl. Chinese, Tang dynasty.

1 Page from the manuscript, "The Art of the Potter," with marginal notes
of text and birds in gold. Persian, mid-15th century.

1 Manuscript painting, Chinese, Yuan dyn., by Ma Chen.

1 Page from the manuscript, "The Art of the Potter," with marginal notes
of text, birds, and birds in gold. Persian, mid-15th century.

1 Page from the manuscript, "The Art of the Potter," with marginal notes
of text and birds in gold. Persian, mid-15th century.

1 Page from the manuscript, "The Art of the Potter," with marginal notes
of text and birds in gold. Persian, mid-15th century.

1 Painting. Chinese, Ming dynasty. Scholar under a pine tree playing a Chin, attributed to Ch'iu Ying.

1 Miniature painting. Indo-Persian, Mughal period, mid-16th century. Landscape showing a prince reading.

1 Kakemono painting. Japanese, 15th century. Portrait of Daruma.

1 Miniature painting from a Dioscorides Manuscript. Mesopotamian, 1224 A.D. Rabid dog bites a man.

1 Silver bottle stand, four eagle design. Persian, Sassanian period,

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by

Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

May 15, 1953.

David E. Finley, Chairman
For the Commission of Fine Arts.

I Painting. Chinese, Ming dynasty. Soldier under a pine tree playing a chiao, attributed to Ch'iu Yung.

I Miniature painting. Indo-Persian, Mughal period, mid-17th century. Landscape showing a winter scene.

I Japanese painting. Japanese, 18th century. Portrait of a woman.

I Miniature painting from a Dioscorides manuscript. Mesopotamian, 1324 A.D. Rabbit dog bites a man.

I Silver bottle stand, four eagle design. Persian, Sassanid period.

It has been recommended for purchase for the British Museum.

A. G. Wrenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Council of the British Museum.

David H. Smith, Chairman
For the Council of the Museum.

15, 1953.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS

The Commission considered the following submissions by the Director of Inspection (Building Inspector) of the District of Columbia:

- (a) Erect one-story building at 1636 Portal Drive, N. W.
(Case No. 1569 submitted May 13, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.
- (b) Alterations to 1741 New York Avenue, N. W.
(Case No. 1570 submitted May 14, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.
- (c) Erect 4 one-story buildings at 8215-21-27-33 West Beach Drive, N. W.
(Case No. 1571 submitted May 14, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.
- (d) Erect aluminum awning at 617 - 15th Street, N. W.
(Case No. 1572 submitted May 14, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.
- (e) Erect aluminum awning at 107 Independence Avenue, S. E.
(Case No. 1573 submitted May 14, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.

CHIEF-CLERK FOR SUBMISSIONS

The Commission considered the following submissions by the Director of

Inspection (Building Inspector) of the District of Columbia:

- (a) Erect one-story building at 1535 Fort St. N. W.
(Case No. 1569 submitted May 13, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.
- (b) Alterations to 1741 New York Avenue, N. W.
(Case No. 1570 submitted May 14, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.
- (c) Erect a one-story building at 8215-21-27-29 West Beach Drive, N. W.
(Case No. 1571 submitted May 14, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.
- (d) Erect aluminum awning at 617 - 15th Street, N. W.
(Case No. 1572 submitted May 14, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.
- (e) Erect aluminum awning at 1417 Independence Avenue, E. E.
(Case No. 1573 submitted May 14, 1953).
Approved, May 15, 1953.